

## ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

September 16, 1986

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Paul Cable  
Norm Dooley  
Stewart Harrod  
Jouett Sheeting  
Richard Taylor

There being a quorum, Chairman Cable called the meeting to order.

Mr. Sheeting made a motion to change the Agenda taking in order Items 1 through 4, skipping to Item 7 and then reviewing Item 6 and Item 5, respectively, followed by approval of minutes. Mr. Taylor seconded the motion which was approved unanimously.

The first item of business was a request from Margaret Trowell, 302 East Third Street for the application of vinyl siding. Mr. Keith Logsdon presented the staff report. Mr. Logsdon showed several slides of the house and stated that the vinyl siding would be applied over the existing wood siding. Mr. Roach of H & R Home Improvement, representing the applicant, stated that double 5 siding would be used and applied in accordance with the guidelines set forth for South Frankfort. Mr. Dooley made a motion to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the installation of vinyl siding at 302 East Third Street. Mr. Harrod seconded the motion which was approved unanimously.

The next item of business was a request from Richard G. Wilson, 406 West Campbell for the application of vinyl siding. Mr. Keith Logsdon presented the staff report. Mr. Logsdon showed several slides of the house and stated that the vinyl siding would be applied over the existing wood siding. He also stated that staff recommended approval with the condition that the masonry on the front of the house be left alone. Mr. Gary Wilson, representing the applicant, stated that 8" siding would be used. Mr. Sheeting made a motion to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application of vinyl siding following the guidelines set forth, and conditioned that the masonry on the front of the house be left. Mr. Harrod seconded the motion which was approved unanimously.

The third item of business was a request from Leonard C. Lee, 218 East Campbell Street for the application of vinyl siding. Mr. Keith Logsdon presented the staff report. Mr. Logsdon showed several slides of the house. Ms. Angela Lee was present representing the applicant. Ms. Lee stated that Donnie Evans of Lawrenceburg would be applying the siding. Mr. Taylor made a motion to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application of vinyl siding for the residence at 218 East Campbell Street provided the applicant contact Mr. Logsdon concerning the guidelines for the application of siding in South Frankfort. Mr. Sheeting seconded the motion which was approved unanimously.

The next item of business was a request from William and Marie Cull for exterior remodeling for the addition of a carport, rear dormer and other minor features at 503 Murray Street. Mr. Keith Logsdon presented the staff report. Mr. Logsdon showed several slides of the property and stated that there has been no letters received or opposition from surrounding neighbors. He also stated that the applicable regulation for this request was Article 17.102 of the Zoning Ordinance. Mr. and Mrs. Cull were present. Mrs. Cull stated that the attic would be opened up with a dormer to the back of the house and would not be seen from the street. She also stated that the stone work would be as nearly as possible to match the original structure which was Queen Anne. Mr. Cull stated that only a portion of the carport would be visible from the street. He also stated that there would still be approximately 20 feet between the carport and the rental house next door. Mr. Dooley made a motion to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the exterior remodeling at 503 Murray Street. Mr. Taylor seconded the motion which was approved unanimously.

The next item of business was a request from Laura S. Kennedy for the removal of an existing fire escape and the installation of a roof mounted "scuttle" for an interior fire escape at 514 Wapping Street. Mr. Keith Logsdon presented the staff report. Mr. Logsdon stated that the proposal meets all the necessary criteria established in Article 17 regarding exterior remodeling. He also stated that if this request was approved it be conditioned on the existing fire escape should not be removed until the new one is complete and passes inspection by the City Building Inspector. Mr. Pat Kennedy, representing the applicant, stated that this proposed interior fire escape would provide another emergency exit for the third floor apartment. Mr. Sheeting made a motion to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the installation of a roof mounted "scuttle" for an interior fire escape at 514 Wapping Street conditioned on leaving the existing fire escape until the proposed fire escape is installed and approved. Mr. Taylor seconded the motion which was approved unanimously.

The next item of business was a request from Gordon Taylor for approval of new construction for townhouses at 412 Wapping Street. Mr. Keith Logsdon presented the staff report. Mr. Logsdon stated that Mr. Taylor proposes to construct six townhouses on the site of the former Todd-Lindsey House at the corner of Wapping and Wilkinson Streets. He stated that the applicable regulations for the Special Historic zone district are found in Article 4.40 and Article 17.101 of the Zoning Ordinance. Mr. Logsdon further stated in regard to new construction that Article 4.407 states that development and redevelopment shall observe the following design criteria: (a) Assure the continuity of architectural styles, building mass and density, as well as the overall character of the area; (b) Protect the open space and landscape features of the district; and (c) Conform to the applicable requirements of Article 17 which includes contemporary design, building materials, relationship to site, height, and width. Mr. Logsdon also stated the following in response to the project:

1. Building Mass and Setback - The setback of all 6 units appears to be appropriate. The building separation is such that two rows of three attached townhouses each are parallel to Wapping Street and the row closest to Wapping Street creates a solid three unit wide residential building which is not consistent with any nearby residential property. The density of this development is greater than any other development in the area;

2. Open Space and Landscape Features - Open space is greenspace or lot area not covered by buildings, parking lots or the like and the density of the proposal creates a situation where less open space can be provided and this is inconsistent with the area. Landscaping for this project consists of the use of trees, shrubs and a 5-6 foot wall. The use of the wall, next to the sidewalks on Wapping Street, does not continue the existing pattern of low fences, hedges and walls that exist along most of Wapping Street, however, the other walls of the proposed project are well placed and much more appropriate.

3. Continuity of Architectural Styles - The applicant and architects should be pressed to go point by point through the proposal concerning the architectural styles, explaining where they came from and why they are using the particular style.

4. Continuity with the Overall Character of the Area - The elimination of the center unit of the townhouses located closest to Wapping Street could decrease density which in turn permits the wall to be placed approximately 20 feet further back and not being directly adjacent to the sidewalk on Wapping Street.

Mr. Logsdon stated, to summarize, the staff felt that the proposal should be cut back to 5, possibly 4 units to satisfy the density problem. He also stated that the units are labeled as single-family townhouses and this could create a problem in subdividing the lots. At this time Mr. Logsdon passed out drawings of the proposal to the Board Members and showed slides of the existing property and several slides of various fences, walls and hedges in existence now in South Frankfort.

Mr. Gordon Taylor, applicant, introduced Mr. Edmund Ely, Landscape Architect and Granville Coblin, Architect. Mr. Taylor stated that he had talked to no member on the Board nor had he had anyone to talk to any Board Member. He stated that he had met with about 20 or 30 people from the neighborhood. Mr. Taylor also stated that the combined square footage of the proposed 6 townhouses is almost 2,000 feet less than the Todd Lindsey House, but the townhouses will occupy more space than the Todd Lindsey House. He then stated that 40 percent of the total area will be greenspace; 20 percent will be for the drive and parking; and 40 percent is building mass. He further stated that there will be a 5 foot 3 inch wall broken with rod iron fence (the existing rod iron fence will be used) and entrance gates. Mr. Taylor also stated that the column at the corner of Wapping and Wilkinson will be moved next to the McDonald house to match the column on Petticoat Lane. He also explained that the buildings on Wapping Street will be at different setbacks and have different heights on the roofs and it will be hard to see the whole structure at one time. Mr. Taylor stated several examples of walls to compare with the wall he proposes to construct such as the Morehead House has a 7 foot wall; Stites and Harbison office on the corner of Main and Wilkinson has a 3 foot 11 inch wall; the Church wall going down Wilkinson at its highest point is 5 feet 10 inches; and the structure at the corner of Washington and Main Streets has a wall that is 8½ feet tall and 78 feet long. He also sited several buildings in the area for building mass such

as the Negus House on the Corner in Celebrities is 110 feet deep and has a 78 foot by 8½ foot wall; Dr. Baughman's building on Washington Street is 72 feet long with a 30 foot wall by 7 feet tall. He also stated that the Morehead House setback is on the street; the Vest-Lindsey House is on the street; the Woman's Club has a setback of 9 feet off the street; and the offices of Hazelrigg and Cox has a setback of 18 feet.

Mr. Taylor (board member) questioned what the setback would be on the Wilkinson Street side compared to the Coblin building. Mr. Gordon Taylor stated that the Coblin building probably has a setback of 25 to 30 feet and the setback of the first building on the Wilkinson Street side would be about 15 feet and would be about 60 feet away from the Coblin building. Mr. Sheetingner questioned if all of the dwellings would be facing the courtyard exposing the rear entrances to the street and Mr. Taylor stated yes.

Mr. David Morgan, Executive Director of the Kentucky Heritage Council, stated that in considering plans for whatever is developed on this lot, the ultimate goal should be a structure that would be compatible with the historic character of the district in terms of size, scale, design, material, color, texture, density of the structure on the lot, common setback to existing buildings and retaining historic and landscape features. He also stated that the proposed structure should definitely be identifiable as new construction, but at the same time, blend in with the overall historic character of the district. Mr. Sheetingner asked Mr. Morgan if he was for or against the current proposal. Mr. Morgan stated that he was against the proposal based on mass, loss of the fence, change of the character and the fact of introducing a new concept--townhouses--which is not appropriate to the historic character of the district, setbacks and overall design of the proposal. Mr. Sheetingner then asked if the proposal was cut back to five buildings would this eliminate one of the Council's objections. Mr. Morgan stated it would definitely be a step in the right direction. Mr. Sheetingner stated that the permitted uses under 4.402 of the guidelines do permit townhouses.

Mrs. Neville Blakemore, National Society of Colonial Dames, read a letter and stated that the chief concerns of the proposed townhouses are inadequate parking, architectural details of the structure, violation of the existing setbacks, increase in population density and lack of greenspace. She further stated that there are no floor plans for these townhouses, and therefore, the neighbors have no idea what the townhouses will look like inside, how the garbage is going to be handled and the furnace, etc.

Mr. Sheetingner then asked Mr. Taylor to respond to the parking situation for the proposed townhouses. Mr. Taylor stated that there will be 6 townhouses with 6 garages, each unit will have its own garage, and then there will be 4 additional parking spaces inside the courtyard. Mr. Logsdon stated that under Section 4.406, parking for residential units may be provided at ½ the ratio required in other districts and Mr. Taylor is allowing for 10 parking places, which is more than ample parking.

Mr. John Gillig, a Board Member of Historic Frankfort, Inc., read a statement and cited the following concerns of Historic Frankfort of the proposed townhouses: the density of the development which places too many buildings

too close to the street; removal of the cast-iron fence and mature trees on the site; and the use of replica buildings. Mr. Sheeting stated that, according to the statement Mr. Gillig just read, should the board turn down this application Historic Frankfort would offer financial assistance to Mr. Taylor. Mr. Sheeting asked Mr. Gillig how much money Historic Frankfort would lend Mr. Taylor and would there be a return on this money. Mr. Gillig stated that assuming that the board has reservations and turns down the application, a design competition would be held; we do not have a proposal or a definite sum of money to offer. Mr. Taylor questioned Mr. Gillig about the use of replica buildings. Mr. Gillig stated that a more contemporary design, but keeping with the design of surrounding property should be used but not to mimic. Mr. Sheeting then stated that according to Section 17.081, contemporary design can complement old architecture and a new building does not have to copy neighborhood buildings but can be as a neighborhood building.

Mr. Gordon Taylor stated that he wanted to clarify that the trees along the street will not be destroyed and the existing fence will be incorporated into the proposed wall and fence.

Mr. Bob Polsgrove, representing the Corner in Celebrities Neighborhood Association, read a statement. Mr. Polsgrove stated that the Neighborhood's main concerns consist of setback, density, building mass, placement on the lot as it relates to the overall character of the area, open space and landscape. Mr. Polsgrove also stated that the setback on the Wapping Street side should conform to that of the McDonald House; the cast-iron fence should be retained as it is the primary remaining link with the previous building; and open, green space is critical from a historic design and a community planning standpoint on the Wapping/Wilkinson Street corner area. He also stated that the front of the buildings should face Wapping Street rather than having them face the interior of the lot with the back entrances facing the street. Mr. Sheeting asked Mr. Polsgrove if knew the setback of the McDonald House and the setbacks of the proposed buildings. Mr. Polsgrove stated that he did know that the setback of the proposed buildings is less than that of the McDonald House. Mr. Gordon Taylor stated that, according to the guidelines, the setback starts where the roof of any structure starts that is attached to the house which would include a porch, and the setback of the McDonald House is 20 feet and the setback of Building #1 is 22 feet; Building #2 is 15 feet; and Building #3 is 20 feet. Mr. Sheeting then stated that to formulate a conclusion, according to the by-laws, there is to be a comparison of the existing property and the adjacent property in order to make a conclusion concerning the setback.

At this time Chairman Cable read a letter from Virginia M. Ewing, President of the National Society of the Colonial Dames of America in the Commonwealth of Kentucky.

Mr. Jim Thompson, Chairman of the Frankfort/Franklin County Planning Commission, stated that because the townhouses will be privately owned, there could possibly be a subdivision of land. He stated that under KRS 100.277: (1) All subdivision of land shall receive commission approval; and (2) No person or agent shall subdivide any land before securing the approval of the Planning Commission. He further stated that approval of this request, before the actual subdivision of the land takes place, is improper.

Mr. Logsdon then stated that Mr. Taylor's request is before the right board and if Mr. Taylor's request is approved and he builds his development as such, and he wants to sell the units off in lots, he could do so as condominiums, which means that everyone owns the grounds together, or if he decides to subdivide this property, he would have to come back before this board to get approval on the setbacks. He further stated that the application would then go before the Planning Commission to see that everything is on the plat before it is recorded at the Court House.

At this time a drawing indicating the green space was submitted and slides were presented by Mr. Ely, Architect for Mr. Taylor, of various buildings and walls located in Frankfort, Lexington and Louisville, for comparison to the proposal.

Ms. Eleanor O'Rear stated that the proposed wall would not detract from the area because in large cities you will find walls of this type and height.

Mr. William Howard, Jr. asked Mr. Taylor if he will incorporate the entire, existing rod iron fence into his proposed wall. Mr. Gordon Taylor stated yes, that the entire fence will be used in his proposal.

Chairman Cable read a letter from Larry W. Moore, 418 Ann Street (copy attached).

Mr. Bill Sturm, an attorney whose office is on Wilkinson Street, stated that his major concern with the proposal was the increase in parking problems the townhouses would create.

After much discussion, Mr. Sheetinger made a motion to request Mr. Taylor to revise the plans, including the elevation and materials (indicating the types of materials) giving consideration to fewer replica details on the building, have site plans showing setbacks with more influence on contemporary design and also to refer to Section 17.101 of the guidelines which give some instructions such as building materials, relationship to sights, height and width, etc. Mr. Sheetinger further requested Mr. Taylor to reduce the number of units from six to five and move the Wapping Street side to the north (where the units are reduced) and make these plans available to Mr. Logsdon's office so that the plans can be reviewed before the next regular board meeting or a special session if necessary. Mr. Harrod seconded the motion which was approved unanimously (5-0).

The next item of business was a request from Ronnie Ratliff for exterior remodeling for the installation of siding at 407 West Broadway. Mr. Keith Logsdon presented the staff report. Mr. Logsdon presented several slides and stated that Mr. Ratliff is proposing to install metal siding, dark blue in color placed vertically over a brick and concrete block building. He stated that work was underway on this project when the City Building Inspector issued a stop work order. He also stated that Article 17.102, relating to exterior remodeling, states that the materials used should be compatible with the building's original materials and artificial siding and false facades should not be applied to older buildings. He also stated that the building is located in the City's Special Historic District and the application of metal siding is incompatible with any nearby buildings.

Ms. Marianne Hulette, representing the applicant, stated that this is a commercial building with offices on the second floor and a warehouse on the first floor. Ms. Hulette stated that the building leaks and the applicant thought if siding was applied this would help eliminate the leaking. She stated that the building had been painted in the past but does not last long enough. Ms. Hulette showed several pictures of other buildings which have this type of siding. She also stated that B-Dry had looked at the building.

Mr. Bob Polsgrave stated he was against the color of the building and perhaps the siding could be painted. Mr. Bill Sturm stated he was opposed to the application of siding because it does not conform to the area. Ms. Ann Ueltschi, 413 West Broadway, stated she does not think this is an improvement to the area and the building should just be painted. Ms. Julie Smither stated she works in this building and it does leak terribly. Ms. Smither stated that she is opposed to the siding because she doesn't feel it would help the problem of leaks. She also presented a petition of 15 signatures opposing the use of tin siding to cover the building which is not in keeping with the historic character of the area.

After discussion Mr. Taylor made a motion to disapprove the application of artificial metal siding on the building located at 407 West Broadway, in the manner in which it was done, and suggest that the applicant return to us with a proposal for modifications that may be more in keeping with Article 17.102, such as (1) painting the building; (2) stucco; (3) artificial siding that would run horizontally; or some other acceptable solution. Mr. Sheeting seconded the motion which was approved (3-2). Mr. Dooley and Mr. Harrod voted no.

The last item of business was approval of minutes. Mr. Harrod made a motion to approve the minutes of the August 12, 1986 meeting as received. Mr. Dooley seconded the motion which was approved unanimously.

Under Staff Discussion Mr. Logsdon stated that at the next meeting the Board would be considering a 106 study, which is a study required by the Federal Government when public money is used in historic areas. He also stated that Mr. Don Jeffers was present concerning this request. Mr. Logsdon handed out a analysis to each Board Member to read before the next Board meeting.

Mr. Dooley asked Mr. Logsdon to get a ruling from the City Attorney on whether or not the Board can meet in closed session during a meeting.

Mr. Sheeting made a motion to adjourn. Mr. Harrod seconded the motion which was approved unanimously.

---

Paul Cable, Chairman